

### **REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on April 7, 2003, and the references cited therewith. Claims 1, 15 and 20 are amended, claims 11 – 14 and 25 – 27 are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1 – 10, 15 – 24, and 28 – 30 are now pending in this application.

The amendments to the claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed, and no new matter has been added. The amendments are made to clarify the claims and are not intended to limit the scope of equivalents to which any claim element may be entitled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks that follow.

### **Examiner Interview**

Applicant acknowledges the in-person interview held on February 24, 2003, between the Examiner and Applicant's attorney during which the claims, the Gourdine reference, and the Perdue reference were discussed. No agreement was reached during the interview.

### **§102 Rejection of the Claims**

In view of the interview of 2/24/03, the rejections set forth in paragraphs 3-5 and in paragraphs 6-8 of the action mailed on 7/5/02 are maintained as follows:

- Paragraph 3 of the 7/5/02 action states that claims 1-6, 9-17, and 20-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Gourdine (U.S. Patent No. 5,422,787).
- Paragraph 5 of the 7/5/02 action states that claims 1, 6, 9-15, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Perdue (U.S. Patent No. 5,563,768).
- Paragraph 6 of the 7/5/02 action states that claims 1, 6, 9-15, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Scholder (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,836).
- Paragraph 7 of the 7/5/02 action states that claims 1, 9-15, 20-21, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Bollesen (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,445).

- Paragraph 8 of the 7/5/02 action states that claims 1, 9-17, 20, 25, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Yu (U.S. Patent No. 5,497,825).

Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not make out a *prima facie* case of anticipation because each one of the references listed above does not teach each element of applicant's claims.

For example, amended independent claim 1 recites:

An apparatus for dissipating heat from an electronic device, the apparatus comprising:

a housing adapted to be closely fitted to a heat sink; the housing having a first end and a second end; and

an air moving device adapted to be *interchangeably* coupled to a first end of the housing, the air moving device to move air through the housing. (*emphasis added*)

In addition, amended independent claim 15 recites:

A computerized system comprising:

a chassis;

an integrated circuit board mounted in the chassis;

a processor coupled to the integrated circuit board; and

a processor cooling system coupled to the processor, the processor cooling system comprising:

a heat sink coupled to the processor;

a housing coupled to the heat sink, the housing positioned in close proximity to the heat sink; and

a fan *interchangeably* coupled to the housing, the fan to create a flow of air through the housing. (*emphasis added*)

Additionally, amended independent claim 20 recites

A method of assembling a cooling system for an integrated circuit, the method comprising:

closely coupling a housing to a heat sink for an integrated circuit; and

*interchangeably* coupling a fan to the housing. (*emphasis added*)

Furthermore, independent claim 28 as originally filed recites:

28. A kit of parts for an electronic component cooling system, the kit comprising:  
one or more heat sink housings adapted to fit over a heat sink for an electronic component; and  
a plurality of *interchangeable* cooling attachments adapted to be combined with the one or more heat sink housings to form an electronic component cooling system. (*emphasis added*)

Applicant respectfully submits that because the air moving device in the references relied on in the Office Action are not *interchangeably* coupled to a housing, the references do not teach each and every element of independent claims 1, 15, 20 and 28. Furthermore, claims 2-10, 16-17, 21-24, and 29-30 depend, directly or indirectly on allowable independent claims 1, 15, 20, and 28 and are patentable over the references for the reasons argued above, plus the elements of the claims.

Thus, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC § 102 rejection of claims 1-6, 9-17, and 20-30 based on Gourdine (U.S. Patent No. 5,422,787).

Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC § 102 rejection of claims 1, 6, 9-15, and 20 based on Perdue (U.S. Patent No. 5,563,768).

Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC § 102 rejection of claims 1, 6, 9-15, and 20 based on Scholder (U.S. Patent No. 5,936,836).

Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC § 102 rejection of claims 1, 9-15, 20-21, and 28-30 based on Bollesen (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,445).

Applicant also respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC § 102 rejection of claims 1, 9-17, 20, 25, and 28-30 based on Yu (U.S. Patent No. 5,497,825).

*Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103*

Paragraph 3 of the 7/5/02 action states claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gourdine (U.S. Patent No. 5,422,787).

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 8 are allowable because they depend indirectly on amended independent claim 1 which applicant submits is allowable for the reasons

stated above. If an independent claim is allowable, then any claim depending there from is allowable.

Thus, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC § 103(a) rejections based on Gourdine.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Claims 18 and 19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant acknowledges the allowability of claims 18 and 19 if rewritten to incorporate the elements of their parent claims. However, in view of the arguments above with respect to independent claim 15, applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 18 and 19 are allowable in their present form.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney 612-349-9592 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE K. KORINSKY ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
612-349-9592

Date May 10, 2004

By Ann M. McCrackin  
Ann M. McCrackin  
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner of Patents, P.O.Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 10 day of May, 2004

ANN MCCRACKIN

Name

Ann M. McCrackin

Signature